

A flexible parametric accelerated failure time model

Michael J. Crowther^{1,2,*}, Patrick Royston³, and Mark Clements²

¹University of Leicester, Biostatistics Research Group, Department of Health Sciences,
University Road, Leicester, LE1 7RH, UK.

²Karolinska Institutet, Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Box 281, S-171
77 Stockholm, Sweden.

³MRC CTU at UCL, 90 High Holborn, Holborn, London WC1V 6LJ, UK.

*michael.crowther@le.ac.uk

Abstract

Accelerated failure time (AFT) models are used widely in medical research, though to a much lesser extent than proportional hazards models. In an AFT model, the effect of covariates act to accelerate or decelerate the time to event of interest, i.e. shorten or extend the time to event. Commonly used parametric AFT models are limited in the underlying shapes that they can capture. In this article, we propose a general parametric AFT model, and in particular concentrate on using restricted cubic splines to model the baseline to provide substantial flexibility. We then extend the model to accommodate time-dependent acceleration factors. Delayed entry is also allowed, and hence, time-dependent covariates. We evaluate the proposed model through simulation, showing substantial improvements compared to standard parametric AFT models. We also show analytically and through simulations that the AFT models are collapsible, suggesting that this model class will be well suited to causal inference. We illustrate the methods with a dataset of patients with breast cancer. User friendly Stata and R software packages are provided.

1 Introduction

Accelerated failure time (AFT) models are commonly used in a variety of settings within the medical literature (Collett, 2003). The interpretation of an acceleration factor can be considered more intuitive, directly adjusting the survival time, either increasing or decreasing it, compared to the interpretation of a hazard ratio, meaning a relative increase or decrease in the event rate (Swindell, 2009). A parametric approach tends to be favoured when fitting an AFT model; however, parametric models are limited by the flexibility of the distribution chosen (Cox et al., 2007; Cox, 2008). Parametric AFT models are particularly prevalent in economic decision modelling, where it is emphasized to fit a wide variety of parametric models (either proportional hazards or accelerated failure time), to obtain the ‘best fitting’ model (Latimer, 2013). Often, extrapolation is required to calculate survival across a lifetime horizon, and hence parametric and flexible approaches are needed. Of course, extrapolation is fraught with dangers, and arguably should only be attempted in the presence of appropriate external data (Andersson et al., 2013).

To our knowledge, the most flexible fully parametric AFT model is the generalized F distribution, a four parameter distribution described by Cox (2008), which often suffers from convergence problems. This contains the more widely used (due to availability of software) generalized gamma as a special case (Cox et al., 2007). Many authors have compared and contrasted accelerated failure time models with the more commonly used proportional hazards metric (Kay and Kinnersley, 2002; Orbe et al., 2002). Lambert et al. (2004) developed a mixture AFT model with frailties, where a short term hazard component was modelled with a Gompertz distribution, and the long term hazard component could be any of the standard parametric AFT models. There have been several efforts to develop smooth accelerated failure time models, including mixtures of normal densities (Komárek et al., 2005), kernel smoothed densities (Zeng and Lin, 2007) and seminonparametric densities (Zhang and Davidian, 2008).

A software implementation of the mixture of normal densities has received modest attention. Rubio et al. (2019) recently proposed a general hazards-based model, utilising the exponentiated-Weibull model to model the baseline function.

Within a proportional hazards metric, the Royston-Parmar flexible parametric model has grown in popularity in recent years, with a number of extensions and developments being proposed (Royston and Lambert, 2011; Liu et al., 2016). The fundamental strength of the model is to use restricted cubic splines to model the underlying baseline function (regardless of scale), and any time-dependent effects. However, there are known limitations with models based on hazard ratios, where the hazard ratios are not collapsible across covariates not associated the exposure of interest (Martinussen and Vansteelandt, 2013), while AFTs are known to be robust to omitted covariates (Hougaard, 1999). Together, this motivates the incorporation of a flexible framework into an accelerated failure time paradigm, which we consider in this article.

AFT models make the assumption of a constant acceleration factor, i.e. the effect of a covariate remains the same across follow-up time, similar to the proportional hazards assumption. Clearly this assumption is open to violation. This motivates the relaxation of the constant acceleration factor to allow time-dependency, similarly to modelling of non-proportional hazards. This has been described within a generalised gamma AFT model by Cox et al. (2007). In this article, we further relax the constant acceleration factor assumption, within the flexible parametric AFT model, by using restricted cubic splines.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we first show that an accelerated failure time model has some desirable properties, including collapsibility, that are not exhibited by a proportional hazards model. In Section 3, we derive the proposed model framework and describe the estimation process within a likelihood framework. In Section 4 we conduct a simulation study to evaluate the finite sample performance of the proposed model under complex scenarios, comparing to standard parametric AFT models. In Section 5 we illustrate the model using data from the England and Wales breast cancer registry. Finally, in Section 6 we conclude the paper with a discussion.

2 Causal interpretation of the accelerated failure time model

Hougaard (1999) provided an informal description of how AFT models are robust to omitted covariates. We now provide a more formal development for the collapsibility of the acceleration factor for AFT models. Consider a model with two covariates X and Z , with an event time T , with regression parameters β_X and β_Z and linear predictor $\beta_X x + \beta_Z z$. Assume that the censoring variable C is independent of X , Z and T , and that the time process is observed by the tuple $(Y = \min(T, C), \Delta = I(T \leq C))$; the associated causal diagram is given in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Causal diagram for the motivating example, with censoring variable C being independent from X , Z and T .

Following Martinussen and Vansteelandt (2013), we define the marginal unadjusted effect for binary $X = 1$ compared with $X = 0$ at time t for a contrast function g and a prediction function ψ as $\mathcal{T}_m(t) = g(\psi(t|x = 1), \psi(t|x = 0))$. The marginal exposure effect (causal effect) is defined as $\mathcal{T}(t) = g(\psi(t|\hat{x} = 1), \psi(t|\hat{x} = 0))$, where $\hat{x} = x$ is the *do* operator, which can be conceptualised as the population value that would be realised if X were uniformly set to x .

2.1 Proportional hazard model

Martinussen and Vansteelandt (2013) considered a proportional hazards model $h(t|x, z) = h_0(t) \exp(\beta_X x + \beta_Z z)$. The marginal hazard conditional on survival has previously been shown to be

$$\begin{aligned} E_Z(h(t|x, Z)|T > t) &= \frac{E_Z(h(t|x, Z)S(t|x, Z))}{E_Z(S(t|x, Z))} \\ &= \frac{h_0(t) \exp(\beta_X x) E_Z(\exp(\beta_Z Z)S(t|x, Z))}{E_Z(S(t|x, Z))} \end{aligned}$$

For the marginal (causal) effect for the log-hazard ratio, we define $\psi(t|\hat{x} = x) = E_Z(h(t|\hat{x} = x, Z)|T > t)$ and $g(a, b) = \log(a/b)$, then the marginal (causal) effect is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(t) &= \log(E_Z(h(t|\hat{x} = 1, Z)|T > t)) - \log(E_Z(h(t|\hat{x} = 0, Z)|T > t)) \\ &= \beta_X + \log\left(\frac{E_Z(\exp(\beta_Z Z)S(t|\hat{x} = 1, Z))}{E_Z(S(t|\hat{x} = 1, Z))}\right) - \log\left(\frac{E_Z(\exp(\beta_Z Z)S(t|\hat{x} = 0, Z))}{E_Z(S(t|\hat{x} = 0, Z))}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

For a marginal unadjusted effect, we define $\psi(t|x) = E_Z(h(t|x, Z)|T > t, X = x)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_m(t) &= \log(E_Z(h(t|x = 1, Z)|T > t, X = 1)) - \log(E_Z(h(t|x = 0, Z)|T > t, X = 0)) \\ &= \beta_X + \log\left(\frac{E_Z(\exp(\beta_Z Z)S(t|x = 1, Z)|X = 1)}{E_Z(S(t|x = 1, Z)|X = 1)}\right) - \log\left(\frac{E_Z(\exp(\beta_Z Z)S(t|x = 0, Z)|X = 0)}{E_Z(S(t|x = 0, Z)|X = 0)}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

These expressions show that β_X is a biased estimator of both the marginal causal effect and the marginal unadjusted effect. We can use Equation (1) to estimate the causal effect $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(t)$ from a model fit incorporating both X and Z , and use Equations (1) and (2) to calculate the confounding bias $\mathcal{T}(t) - \mathcal{T}_m(t)$. We can also use Equation (2) to calculate the bias in the unadjusted estimate for β_X when Z is not modelled compared with modelling both X and Z (that is, $\mathcal{T}_m(t) - \beta_X$) when $\beta_Z \neq 0$ and X and Z are associated.

2.2 Accelerated failure time model

Now define an accelerated failure time model $\log(T) = \alpha - (\beta_X x + \beta_Z z) + \epsilon$, where $\alpha = -\beta_0$ and $E(\epsilon) = 0$. For the marginal (causal) effect for the mean time to event comparing $X = 1$ with $X = 0$, define $\psi(t|x) = E_Z(\log(T)|\hat{x} = x, Z)$ and $g(a, b) = a - b$, such that

$$\mathcal{T} = E_Z(\log(T)|\hat{x} = 1, Z) - E_Z(\log(T)|\hat{x} = 0, Z) = -\beta_X$$

which is unbiased and indicates *collapsibility* of the acceleration factor. For the marginal unadjusted effect, let $\psi(t|x) = E_Z(\log(T)|X = x, Z)$, so that

$$\mathcal{T}_m = -\beta_X - \beta_Z(E_Z(Z|X = 1) - E_Z(Z|X = 0))$$

which will be biased if, again, $\beta_Z \neq 0$ and X and Z are associated. We can extend this finding to a time-dependent accelerated failure time model $S(t|x, z) = S_0\left(\int_0^t \exp(\eta(u|x, z))du\right)$ for a time-varying acceleration factor $\eta(u|x, z) = -\beta_X(u)x - \beta_Z(u)z$ and for a baseline survival function $S_0(t)$. The marginal value for $\eta(t|x, Z)$ conditional on survival is

$$E_Z(\eta(t|x, Z)|T > t) = -\beta_X(t)x - \beta_Z(t)E_Z(Z|x)$$

then the marginal (causal) effect comparing $X = 1$ with $X = 0$ at time t is

$$\mathcal{T}(t) = E_Z(\eta(t|\hat{x} = 1, Z)) - E_Z(\eta(t|\hat{x} = 0, Z)) = -\beta_X(t)$$

For the marginal unadjusted effect, let $\psi(t|x) = E_Z(\eta(t|x, Z))$, and then

$$\mathcal{T}_m(t) = -\beta_X(t) - \beta_Z(t)(E_Z(Z|X = 1) - E_Z(Z|X = 0))$$

Pleasantly, if $E_Z(Z|X = 1) - E_Z(Z|X = 0)$ is small, then $\mathcal{T}_m(t) \approx -\beta_X(t)$ and the AFT can be shown to be robust to omitted covariates.

3 A general parametric accelerated failure time model

Continuing with the notation defined in the previous section, an accelerated failure time model, conditional on a set of explanatory variables, \mathbf{X} , can be written in the form of the survival function,

$$S(t|\mathbf{X}) = S_0(t\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))$$

where often

$$\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \exp(-\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}) \quad (3)$$

We can also specify an AFT model in terms of the cumulative hazard function

$$H(t|\mathbf{X}) = H_0(t\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta})) \quad (4)$$

In essence, we can specify any parametric function for Equation (4), subject to the appropriate constraints that the function remains positive for all $t > 0$ and is monotonically increasing as $t \rightarrow \infty$. In this article, we concentrate on a highly flexible way of specifying a parametric AFT, using restricted cubic splines as our basis functions Durrleman and Simon (1989).

Similarly to Royston and Parmar (2002), we begin with the log cumulative hazard function of the Weibull distribution,

$$\log H(t|\lambda, \gamma) = \log(\lambda) + \gamma \log(t)$$

Instead of incorporating covariates into the linear predictor of the $\log(\lambda)$ component, as in Royston and Parmar (2002), here we incorporate them as a multiplicative effect on t ,

$$\log H(t|\mathbf{X}, \lambda, \gamma, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \log(\lambda) + \gamma \log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))$$

where $\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is defined in Equation (3). Now we can incorporate the desired flexibility, expanding $\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))$ into restricted cubic spline basis. For simplicity, letting $u = \log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))$, our spline function is defined as

$$s(u|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 v_1(u, \mathbf{k}_0) + \gamma_2 v_2(u, \mathbf{k}_0) + \cdots + \gamma_{m+1} v_{m+1}(u, \mathbf{k}_0)$$

where \mathbf{k}_0 is a vector of knot locations with parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, and derived variables v_j (known as the basis functions). For a truncated power basis, the v_j are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} v_1(u, \mathbf{k}_0) &= u \\ v_j(u, \mathbf{k}_0) &= (u - k_j)_+^3 - \lambda_j (u - k_{\min})_+^3 - (1 - \lambda_j)(u - k_{\max})_+^3 \end{aligned}$$

where for $j = 2, \dots, m+1$, $(u - k_j)_+^3$ is equal to $(u - k_j)^3$ if the value is positive and 0 otherwise, and

$$\lambda_j = \frac{k_{\max} - k_j}{k_{\max} - k_{\min}}$$

Alternatively, the $v_j(u, \mathbf{k}_0)$ can be calculated using a B-spline basis with a matrix projection at the boundary knots, as per the `ns` function in R. Given one of these bases, our flexible parametric AFT model can be defined as

$$\log H(t|\mathbf{X}) = s(\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0)$$

Usually, knot locations are calculated based on quantiles of the distribution of the variable being transformed into splines, in this case $\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))$, also restricted to those observations which are uncensored.

3.1 Likelihood and estimation

We define the likelihood in terms of the hazard and survival functions. The hazard function can be written as follows

$$\begin{aligned} h(t|\mathbf{X}) &= \frac{d}{dt}H(t|\mathbf{X}) \\ &= \exp[s(\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0)] \times \frac{d}{dt}[s(\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0)] \\ &= \exp[s(\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0)] \times \frac{1}{t} \times s'(\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0) \end{aligned}$$

where $s'(x) = \frac{d}{dx}s(x)$. The survival function is defined as

$$S(t|\mathbf{X}) = \exp[-\exp\{s(\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0)\}]$$

We can therefore define our log likelihood for the i^{th} patient, allowing for delayed entry, as

$$\begin{aligned} l_i &= d_i \log h(y_i) + \log S(y_i) - \log S(t_{0i}) \\ &= d_i \times [s(\log(y_i\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0) - \log(y_i) + \log(s'(\log(y_i\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0))] \\ &\quad - \exp\{s(\log(y_i\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0)\} + \exp\{s(\log(t_{0i}\phi(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0)\} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We maximise Equation (5) using Newton-Raphson based optimisation (Gould et al., 2010), with analytic score and Hessian.

3.2 Time-dependent acceleration factors

Following Cox and Oakes (1984) and Hougaard (1999), we have the survival function of a time-dependent AFT model, such that

$$S(t) = S_0 \left(\int_0^t \eta(\mathbf{X}, u; \boldsymbol{\beta}) \, du \right)$$

where $\eta(\mathbf{X}, u; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is the time-varying acceleration factor at time u and the baseline survival is $S_0(t) = \exp(-\exp(s(\log(t)|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0))$). Within our flexible parametric framework, we can avoid the integration by directly modelling on the cumulative scale, such that

$$S_0 \left(\int_0^t \eta(\mathbf{X}, u; \boldsymbol{\beta}) \, du \right) = S_0(t \times \phi(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta}))$$

Since we are on a cumulative scale, to recover the directly interpretable time-dependent acceleration factor, $\eta(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta})$, we derive the following relationship,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \eta(\mathbf{X}, u; \boldsymbol{\beta}) \, du &= t \times \phi(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta}) \\ \implies \eta(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \frac{d}{dt} [t\phi(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta})] \\ &= \phi(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta}) + t \frac{d}{dt} \phi(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta}) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

which gives a rather convenient formula for the time-dependent acceleration factor in terms of its cumulative. We can arguably use any continuous function to capture simple and complex time-dependent acceleration factors. The hazard function is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} h(t|\mathbf{X}) &= \exp[s(\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}, t))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0)] \times \frac{d}{dt}[s(\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}, t))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0)] \\ &= \exp[s(\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}, t))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0)] \times \frac{t \frac{d\phi(\mathbf{X}, t)}{dt} + \phi(\mathbf{X}, t)}{t\phi(\mathbf{X}, t)} \times s'(\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}, t))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Our form of choice continues the use of restricted cubic splines. A common case is to use a minus log link for the linear predictor, such that

$$\phi(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \exp \left(-\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} - \sum_{p=1}^P x_p s(\log(t)|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_p, \mathbf{k}_p) \right) \quad (8)$$

where for the p^{th} time-dependent effect, with $p = \{1, \dots, P\}$, we have x_p , the p^{th} covariate, multiplied by some spline function of log time, $s(\log(t)|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_p, \mathbf{k}_p)$, with knot location vector, \mathbf{k}_p , and coefficient vector, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_p$.

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\phi(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta})}{dt} &= \frac{d}{dt} \exp \left(-\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} - \sum_{p=1}^P x_p s(\log(t)|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_p, \mathbf{k}_p) \right) \\ &= \phi(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta}) \times \frac{d}{dt} \left[-\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} - \sum_{p=1}^P x_p s(\log(t)|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_p, \mathbf{k}_p) \right] \\ &= \phi(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta}) \times \left[-\sum_{p=1}^P x_p \frac{d \log(t)}{dt} \frac{d}{d \log(t)} s(\log(t)|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_p, \mathbf{k}_p) \right] \\ &= \frac{\phi(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta})}{t} \times \left[-\sum_{p=1}^P x_p s'(\log(t)|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_p, \mathbf{k}_p) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Substituting Equation (9) into (7)

$$h(t|\mathbf{X}) = \exp[s(\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta}))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0)] \times s'(\log(\phi(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta}))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0) \times \frac{1}{t} \times \left[1 - \sum_{p=1}^P x_p s'(\log(t)|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_p, \mathbf{k}_p) \right] \quad (10)$$

with survival function

$$S(t|\mathbf{X}) = \exp[-\exp\{s(\log(t\phi(\mathbf{X}, t; \boldsymbol{\beta}))|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{k}_0)\}] \quad (11)$$

Equations (10) and (11) can then be substituted into Equation (5) to maximise the log likelihood. Analytic scores and Hessian elements can also be derived.

4 Simulations

4.1 Causal inference

We first simulate under Figure 1. Assume that X is Bernoulli, Z is normal, T is exponential and C is uniform. Specifically, let $X \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$, $Z \sim \text{Normal}(0, 2^2)$, $T \sim \text{Exponential}(\exp(\beta_0 + \beta_X X + \beta_Z Z))$, $\beta_0 = -5$, $\beta_X = \beta_Z = 1$, $C \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 10)$ and $(Y, \Delta) = (\min(T, C), T < C)$. Let (x, z, y, δ) be realisations for (X, Z, Y, Δ) . These data can be modelled using both proportional hazards and accelerated failure time models. We fit models for (y, δ) with both x and z as linear and additive covariates and with only x as a covariate. We model using Poisson regression, Cox regression and our smooth AFT with 3 degrees of freedom (see Table 1). Note that the estimated β_X 's have opposite signs for the AFT models compared with the proportional hazards models (Poisson and Cox regression). As a reminder, an exponential AFT would estimate $-\beta_X$ as per the Poisson regression. We find that all of the models are unbiased when both covariates are included ($|E(\hat{\beta}_X)| = 1$).

When X and Z are independent, then the effect of X is not confounded by Z and $\mathcal{T}_m(t) = \mathcal{T}(t)$. For the AFT models, assuming that we have captured the baseline distribution, then $E_Z(Z|X = 1) = E_Z(Z|X = 0)$ and $\mathcal{T}_m(t) = -\beta_X(t)$. However, for the proportional hazards models with both covariates, the marginal (causal) effect is attenuated for increasing time. This pattern of attenuation

is well recognised from the context of frailty models (e.g. Aalen et al. (2008)). Moreover, when the covariate z is not included and X and Z are correlated, then the first three models are more biased, while the smooth AFT is less biased.

Table 1: Simulation results for exponentially distributed data with $\beta_X = 1$, with $n = 10^4$ observations per simulation and 300 simulation sets. The regression models assume that both covariates are modelled $((y, \delta) \sim x + z)$ or that only the x covariate is modelled $((y, \delta) \sim x)$. The expectations for the estimated β_X and their standard errors are over the simulation sets.

Corr(X, Z)	Model	$(y, \delta) \sim x + z$		$(y, \delta) \sim x$	
		$E(\hat{\beta}_X)$	$E(se(\hat{\beta}_X))$	$E(\hat{\beta}_X)$	$E(se(\hat{\beta}_X))$
0	Poisson regression	0.998	0.054	0.679	0.053
	Cox regression	0.999	0.054	0.663	0.053
	Smooth AFT	-0.998	0.055	-0.962	0.079
0.1	Poisson regression	0.998	0.054	0.901	0.054
	Cox regression	0.999	0.055	0.880	0.054
	Smooth AFT	-0.998	0.056	-1.278	0.083
-0.1	Poisson regression	0.998	0.053	0.464	0.052
	Cox regression	0.999	0.054	0.454	0.052
	Smooth AFT	-0.998	0.055	-0.657	0.077

4.2 Other simulations

In this section we conduct a simulation study to assess the ability of the flexible parametric AFT model to capture complex, biologically plausible, baseline functions, and subsequently the impact on estimates of acceleration factors and survival probabilities, when misspecifying the baseline. We also compare the newly proposed flexible AFT to existing parametric models, including the Weibull, generalized gamma, and generalized F. The Weibull and generalized gamma models are available in the `streg` command in Stata, and we implement the generalized F in Stata, following Cox (2008).

In all simulations, we use a range of two-component mixture Weibull baseline hazard functions, and also a standard Weibull, to generate complex, realistic scenarios (Crowther and Lambert, 2013). When fitting the flexible parametric models, we are therefore not fitting the ‘true’ model, but investigating how well the spline approximations can do (Rutherford et al., 2015). The baseline survival function for a two-component mixture Weibull is defined as follows:

$$S_0(t) = p \exp(-\lambda_1 t^{\gamma_1}) + (1 - p) \exp(-\lambda_2 t^{\gamma_2}) \quad (12)$$

We choose four different baseline hazard functions, representing clinically plausible functions (Royston and Lambert, 2011; Murtaugh et al., 1994). The four assumed baseline hazard functions are shown in Figure 2. Scenarios 1 to 3 come from mixture Weibull functions defined in Equation (12), with Scenario 4 a standard Weibull function. With our baseline functions defined, we can choose to simulate under an accelerated failure time framework, or under proportional hazards, using the general survival simulation framework developed by Crowther and Lambert (2013).

Consider a binary treatment group variable, X , with a log acceleration factor, β . We can simulate accelerated failure time data from the following,

$$\begin{aligned} S(t|X) &= p \exp(-\lambda_1 (te^{-X\beta})^{\gamma_1}) + (1 - p) \exp(-\lambda_2 (te^{-X\beta})^{\gamma_2}) \\ &= p \exp(-\lambda_1 t^{\gamma_1} e^{-X\beta\gamma_1}) + (1 - p) \exp(-\lambda_2 t^{\gamma_2} e^{-X\beta\gamma_2}) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

For each scenario, we assume a log AF of $\beta = -0.5$, or $\beta = 0.5$. This results in 8 scenarios in total.

To each simulated dataset, we apply a Weibull AFT model, a generalised gamma AFT model, a generalized F AFT model and the proposed flexible parametric AFT model with 2 to 9 degrees of




Figure 2: Baseline hazard functions for the simulation scenarios.

freedom. We do not fit a flexible parametric acceleration failure time model with 1 degree of freedom, as this is equivalent to a Weibull AFT model. Each simulation scenario is repeated 250 times with 1000 observations in each dataset. We set a maximum follow-up time of 5 years. The following average survival probability at 5 years was observed in each scenario; $\bar{S}(5) = 0.03$ in scenario 1 and $\beta = -0.5$, $\bar{S}(5) = 0.106$ in scenario 1 and $\beta = 0.5$, $\bar{S}(5) = 0.040$ in scenario 2 and $\beta = -0.5$, $\bar{S}(5) = 0.071$ in scenario 1 and $\beta = 0.5$, $\bar{S}(5) = 0.131$ in scenario 3 and $\beta = -0.5$, $\bar{S}(5) = 0.289$ in scenario 3 and $\beta = 0.5$, $\bar{S}(5) = 0.393$ in scenario 4 and $\beta = -0.5$, $\bar{S}(5) = 0.592$ in scenario 4 and $\beta = 0.5$.

We monitor estimates of β from all models, and estimates of the survival probability at 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 years, in both treatment groups. Survival was monitored on the $\log[-\log(\cdot)]$ scale, with standard errors calculated using the delta method. We also monitor values of the AIC and BIC.

4.3 Simulation results

Results are presented in Table 2 for all 8 scenarios. We present bias, percentage bias, and coverage for the estimates of the log acceleration factor from all AFT models. We further present the median rank in terms of best fitting model based on either the AIC or BIC, for all models fitted. Finally, in Tables 3 to 6 we present bias, percentage bias, and coverage for estimates of the survival probability at 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 years, for the four scenarios, when $X = 0$ and $\beta = 0.5$, $X = 1$ and $\beta = 0.5$, $X = 0$ and $\beta = -0.5$, $X = 1$ and $\beta = -0.5$, respectively, with all estimates are on the $\log\{-\log[S(t)]\}$ scale.

From Table 2, looking at scenarios 1 to 3, the Weibull AFT model gives substantial bias in estimates of the log acceleration factor, and poor coverage probabilities. Similarly, but to a lesser extent, the generalised gamma also indicates some bias and poor coverage, but in addition an important proportion of models, 69 out of 250, failed to converge in Scenario 3 when $\beta = 0.5$. The generalised F model performed particularly poorly as a substantial proportional in most scenarios failed to converge; therefore the bias and coverage estimates calculated only on models which converged, should be interpreted with caution. Results based on those that did converge indicate some bias across scenarios, but particularly poor coverage across all scenarios. In all scenarios, the flexible parametric AFT performed well across varying degrees of freedom. In scenarios 1 to 3, there was a FPAFT with a specific degree of freedom (or multiple), that outperformed the Weibull, generalized gamma, and generalized F, both in terms of less bias and coverage probabilities closer to the optimum of 95%. When there was bias in specific degrees of freedom, the AIC and BIC indicated a more appropriate well fitting model, generally with the least bias. For example, in Scenario 1 with $\beta = -0.5$, the FPAFT with $df=2$ had -10.6% bias and coverage probability of 68.4% and on average was the 10th best fitting model based on both the AIC and BIC; however, all other degrees of freedom were better fitting, for example, with $df=7$, percentage bias was -0.4% with coverage of 94.8%, ranked 2nd and 5th on average in terms of AIC and BIC, respectively. In Scenario 4, where the true model was a Weibull (equivalent to FPAFT with $df=1$), generally all models estimated the log acceleration factor

with minimal bias; however, coverage began to be suboptimum as the degrees of freedom increased in the FPAFT, clearly due to over-fitting. Generally, a flexible parametric AFT model was the best fitting in terms of both AIC and BIC, apart from scenario 4 where the true Weibull model (which is equivalent to a flexible parametric AFT with 1 degree of freedom). In some settings the generalized F was best fitting; however, this is based only on estimates that converged (for example scenario 3 and $\beta = -0.5$, only 106 out of 250 converged).

Moving to estimates of survival in Tables 3 to 6, in scenarios 1 to 3, the Weibull model produced substantial bias and poor coverage, compared to excellent performance in scenario 4 when the truth was Weibull. Both the generalized gamma and generalized F models produced varying levels of bias and poor coverage, particularly the generalised F, across all 4 scenarios. Both suffered from varying levels of lack of convergence, and also the delta method failed to calculate a standard error in a small number of simulations. The flexible parametric model performed well across all 4 scenarios; there was at least one degree of freedom which provided generally unbiased estimates of survival in each treatment group, with coverage around the 95% optimum.

5 Breast cancer in England and Wales

To illustrate the proposed AFT model, we use a dataset of 9721 women aged under 50 and diagnosed with breast cancer in England and Wales between 1986 and 1990. Our event of interest is death from any cause, where 2,847 events were observed, and we have restricted follow-up to 5 years, leading to 6,850 censored at 5 years. We are interested in the effect of deprivation status, which was categorised into 5 levels; however, in this example we restrict our analyses to comparing the least and most deprived groups. We subsequently have a binary covariate, with 0 for the least deprived and 1 for the most deprived group.

We fit Weibull, generalized gamma, generalized F and the proposed AFT models with 2 to 9 degrees of freedom, and present estimates of the log acceleration factor for the effect of deprivation status, its standard error and associated 95% confidence interval in Table 7, and also model fit statistics, namely the AIC and BIC.

Table 7 indicates that the best fitting model, both in terms of lowest AIC and BIC, is the flexible parametric AFT model with 3 degrees of freedom. This estimates an acceleration factor of 0.744 (95% CI: 0.689, 0.803) for the effect of deprivation status, indicating a patient's survival time is reduced by 25.6% (95% CI: 19.7%, 31.1%) by being in the most deprived group, compared to the least deprived.

The differences in AIC and BIC are substantial between the best fitting model, and those commonly used, namely the Weibull, gamma and F models. We also observe important variation in the estimates of the effect of deprivation status between the FPAFT with $df=3$, and the Weibull, gamma and F model estimates.

We illustrate the fitted AFT models in Figure 3, showing the fitted survival function for both deprivation groups, for the Weibull, gamma, F and best fitting flexible AFT model, overlaid on the Kaplan-Meier estimates. It is evident from Figure 4 that the flexible AFT fits substantially better than the other models.

6 Discussion

Accelerated failure time models provide an attractive alternative to the proportional hazards framework, particularly for patients, as an acceleration factor can have a more intuitive meaning, directly increasing/decreasing survival time, rather than the event rate. Many authors have argued that AFT models are underused in applied research (Swindell, 2009; Kay and Kinnersley, 2002; Ng et al., 2015). Indeed, estimates have been shown to be more robust to covariate omission, compared to proportional hazards models (Lambert et al., 2004; Keiding et al., 1997). In this article we proposed a new general parametric accelerated failure time model. We focused on the use of restricted cubic splines to provide a highly flexible framework with which to capture complex, biologically plausible functions. Our model can be thought of as an accelerated failure time formulation of that proposed by Royston





Figure 3: Fitted survival for each deprivation groups, for Weibull, gamma, and Flexible parametric AFT (df=3) models.



(a) Proportional hazards model.

(b) Accelerated failure time model.

Figure 4: Fitted survival function for the best fitting flexible parametric models in the proportional hazards and accelerated failure time metrics.

and Parmar (2002). Furthermore, we extended the framework to allow time-dependent acceleration factors.

Accelerated failure time models show considerable promise for causal inference. In particular, the log acceleration factors are collapsible for omitted covariates that are uncorrelated with the exposure of interest, whereas the proportional hazards models are sensitive to such random effects or frailties. Moreover, the proportional hazards model have a difficult causal interpretation (see Equations (1)).

We conducted a simulation study to evaluate the performance of the proposed AFT model, indicating excellent performance in a variety of complex, but plausible, settings. In our scenarios, it outperformed the Weibull, generalized gamma and generalized F models, both in terms of minimizing bias in estimates of the acceleration factor and coverage probabilities closer to the optimum 95%. Furthermore, we found that model selection criteria can aid in selecting degrees of freedom, both to select a model with minimal bias, but also a model which capture the baseline to provide reliable estimates of absolute risk such as survival probabilities. The proposed flexible parametric AFT models is also highly computationally efficient.

An accelerated failure time model will be most appropriate when the covariate effects are multiplicative on a time scale. This scale is intuitive for modelling life expectancy, but is more difficult to interpret in terms of competing risks. To describe this difficulty, consider dividing causes of death into two groups, where an exposure affect the causes of death with different acceleration factors. Then survival from all cause will be the product of two survival probabilities which have “ageing” at different rates for the different causes.

In contrast, the proportional hazards models assume that the covariate effects are multiplicative on the hazards scale. This scale is more intuitive for modelling system dynamics and for competing risks, but these models have a difficult causal interpretation and they are less intuitive for the lay person. As a third model class, the additive hazards model are intuitive for effects operating as competing events and have a straightforward causal interpretation, however they are less intuitive for interpreting effects on the same mechanistic pathway.

Extensions to the framework that would be useful include incorporating random effects, to account for clustered structures and unobserved heterogeneity (Lambert et al., 2004; Crowther et al., 2014), and the extension to interval censoring, possibly in combination with delayed entry.

We provide user-friendly Stata and R software packages to allow researchers to directly use the proposed model framework. For Stata, the command can be installed by typing `ssc install staft`. For R, the `rstpm2` package on CRAN provides an `aft` regression function.

References

- Aalen, O., Borgan, O., and Gjessing, H. (2008). *Survival and Event History Analysis: A Process Point of View*. Statistics for Biology and Health. Springer-Verlag.
- Andersson, T. M.-L., Dickman, P. W., Eloranta, S., Lambe, M., and Lambert, P. C. (2013). Estimating the loss in expectation of life due to cancer using flexible parametric survival models. *Statistics in medicine* **32**, 5286–5300.
- Collett, D. (2003). *Modelling Survival Data in Medical Research*. Chapman & Hall.
- Cox, C. (2008). The generalized f distribution: an umbrella for parametric survival analysis. *Stat Med* **27**, 4301–4312.
- Cox, C., Chu, H., Schneider, M. F., and Munoz, A. (2007). Parametric Survival Analysis and Taxonomy of Hazard Functions for the Generalized Gamma Distribution. *Stat Med* **26**, 4352–4374.
- Cox, D. R. and Oakes, D. (1984). *Analysis of survival data*, volume 21. CRC Press.
- Crowther, M. J. and Lambert, P. C. (2013). Simulating biologically plausible complex survival data. *Stat Med* **32**, 4118–4134.
- Crowther, M. J., Look, M. P., and Riley, R. D. (2014). Multilevel mixed effects parametric survival models using adaptive gauss-hermite quadrature with application to recurrent events and individual participant data meta-analysis. *Stat Med* **33**, 3844–3858.
- Durrleman, S. and Simon, R. (1989). Flexible Regression Models with Cubic Splines. *Stat Med* **8**, 551–561.
- Gould, W., Pitblado, J., and Poi, B. (2010). *Maximum Likelihood Estimation with Stata*. Stata Press, 4th edition edition.
- Hougaard, P. (1999). Fundamentals of survival data. *Biometrics* **55**, 13–22.
- Kay, R. and Kinnersley, N. (2002). On the use of the accelerated failure time model as an alternative to the proportional hazards model in the treatment of time to event data: a case study in influenza. *Drug information journal* **36**, 571–579.
- Keiding, N., Andersen, P. K., and Klein, J. P. (1997). The role of frailty models and accelerated failure time models in describing heterogeneity due to omitted covariates. *Statistics in medicine* **16**, 215–224.
- Komárek, A., Lesaffre, E., and Hilton, J. F. (2005). Accelerated failure time model for arbitrarily censored data with smoothed error distribution. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **14**, 726–745.

- Lambert, P., Collett, D., Kimber, A., and Johnson, R. (2004). Parametric accelerated failure time models with random effects and an application to kidney transplant survival. *Stat Med* **23**, 3177–3192.
- Latimer, N. R. (2013). Survival analysis for economic evaluations alongside clinical trials—extrapolation with patient-level data: inconsistencies, limitations, and a practical guide. *Med Decis Making* **33**, 743–754.
- Liu, X.-R., Pawitan, Y., and Clements, M. (2016). Parametric and penalized generalized survival models. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* page 0962280216664760.
- Martinussen, T. and Vansteelandt, S. (2013). On collapsibility and confounding bias in Cox and Aalen regression models. *Lifetime Data Analysis* **19**, 279–296.
- Murtaugh, P., Dickson, E., Van Dam, G. Malincho, M., and Grambsch, P. (1994). Primary biliary cirrhosis: Prediction of short-term survival based on repeated patient visits. *Hepatology* **20**, 126–134.
- Ng, E. S.-W., Klungel, O. H., Groenwold, R. H., and Staa, T.-P. (2015). Risk patterns in drug safety study using relative times by accelerated failure time models when proportional hazards assumption is questionable: an illustrative case study of cancer risk of patients on glucose-lowering therapies. *Pharmaceutical Statistics* **14**, 382–394.
- Orbe, J., Ferreira, E., and Núñez-Antón, V. (2002). Comparing proportional hazards and accelerated failure time models for survival analysis. *Statistics in medicine* **21**, 3493–3510.
- Royston, P. and Lambert, P. C. (2011). *Flexible Parametric Survival Analysis Using Stata: Beyond the Cox Model*. Stata Press.
- Royston, P. and Parmar, M. K. B. (2002). Flexible Parametric Proportional Hazards and Proportional Odds Models for Censored Survival Data, with Application to Prognostic Modelling and Estimation of Treatment Effects. *Stat Med* **21**, 2175–2197.
- Rubio, F. J., Remontet, L., Jewell, N. P., and Belot, A. (2019). On a general structure for hazard-based regression models: An application to population-based cancer research. *Statistical methods in medical research* **28**, 2404–2417.
- Rutherford, M. J., Crowther, M. J., and Lambert, P. C. (2015). The use of restricted cubic splines to approximate complex hazard functions in the analysis of time-to-event data: a simulation study. *J Statist Comput Simulation* **85**, 777–793.
- Swindell, W. R. (2009). Accelerated failure time models provide a useful statistical framework for aging research. *Exp Gerontol* **44**, 190–200.
- Zeng, D. and Lin, D. Y. (2007). Efficient estimation for the accelerated failure time model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **102**, 1387–1396.
- Zhang, M. and Davidian, M. (2008). “Smooth” semiparametric regression analysis for arbitrarily censored time-to-event data. *Biometrics* **64**, 567–576.

Table 2: Simulation results

True log(AF)	Model	Scenario 1						Scenario 2						Scenario 3						Scenario 4					
		Bias	% Bias	Cov.	AIC	BIC	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	AIC	BIC	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	AIC	BIC	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	AIC	BIC	# Conv.
0.5	Weibull	-0.082	-16.4	20.8	11	11	250	-0.049	-9.8	92.0	11	10	250	0.138	27.6	70.8	11	9	250	0.003	0.6	96.4	1	1	250
	Gamma	-0.033	-6.6	84.0	9	9	250	-0.074	-14.8	84.0	10	10	250	0.032	6.4	70.4	5	2	181	0.005	1.0	89.6	3	3	235
	GenF	0.001	0.2	92.8	7	1	247	0.000	0.0	73.6	6	1	191	0.032	6.4	41.2	5	3	109	0.021	4.2	51.6	5	5	140
	FPAFT-df=2	-0.011	-2.2	94.0	10	10	250	-0.076	-15.2	82.0	9	8	250	0.107	21.4	78.0	10	7	250	0.005	1.0	95.6	3	3	250
	FPAFT-df=3	0.021	4.2	88.4	8	3	250	0.019	3.8	96.0	8	7	250	0.024	4.8	95.6	2	2	250	0.006	1.2	94.0	5	4	250
	FPAFT-df=4	0.011	2.2	92.4	3.5	2	250	0.023	4.6	91.6	6	2	250	0.003	0.6	96.0	3	4	250	0.005	1.0	92.4	6	6	249
	FPAFT-df=5	0.008	1.6	94.0	2	4	250	0.019	3.8	92.0	4	3	250	0.006	1.2	95.6	4	5	250	0.005	1.0	88.8	7	7	245
	FPAFT-df=6	0.005	1.0	92.4	3	5	250	0.014	2.8	92.4	3	4	250	0.008	1.6	95.2	6	6	248	0.008	1.6	85.2	8	8	238
	FPAFT-df=7	0.004	0.8	91.6	4	6	246	0.011	2.2	92.8	3	5	248	0.007	1.4	94.8	7	8	250	0.013	2.6	73.6	9	9	226
	FPAFT-df=8	0.004	0.8	87.2	5	7	239	0.009	1.8	90.4	4	6	245	0.007	1.4	90.8	7	9	244	0.009	1.8	68.8	10	10	225
	FPAFT-df=9	0.003	0.6	80.4	6	8	227	0.009	1.8	86.8	5	7	243	0.008	1.6	85.2	9	11	236	0.012	2.4	60.0	11	11	217
	-0.5	Weibull	0.057	-11.4	59.6	11	11	250	0.041	-8.2	93.2	10	9	250	0.008	-1.6	96.0	10	10	250	0.003	-0.6	96.4	1	1
Gamma		0.011	-2.2	93.2	10	10	248	0.047	-9.4	92.0	10	11	250	0.077	-15.4	80.0	8	5	250	0.001	-0.2	95.6	3	3	250
GenF		0.001	-0.2	92.8	3	2	248	0.001	-0.2	70.0	7	1	183	-0.002	0.4	41.6	2	1	106	-0.011	2.2	72.8	5	5	188
FPAFT-df=2		0.026	-5.2	88.0	9	9	250	0.040	-8.0	92.0	9	9	250	0.038	-7.6	94.8	9	7	250	0.001	-0.2	96.0	3	3	250
FPAFT-df=3		-0.001	0.2	94.0	2	1	250	0.107	-21.4	79.6	8	7	250	0.042	-8.4	91.6	7	5	250	0.000	0.0	96.0	5	4	250
FPAFT-df=4		-0.004	0.8	94.8	3	3	249	0.009	-1.8	92.4	4	1	250	0.062	-12.4	85.6	6	3	250	-0.000	0.0	94.4	6	6	250
FPAFT-df=5		-0.002	0.4	94.8	4	4	250	0.003	-0.6	94.8	2	3	250	0.045	-9.0	82.8	5	2.5	250	0.000	0.0	94.8	7	7	249
FPAFT-df=6		0.000	0.0	91.2	5	5	244	-0.004	0.8	94.4	3	4	250	0.031	-6.2	86.4	3	4	249	-0.000	0.0	89.6	8	8	242
FPAFT-df=7		0.003	-0.6	89.6	6	6	239	-0.004	0.8	93.2	3	5	244	0.022	-4.4	88.0	3	6	247	0.004	-0.8	80.8	9	9	229
FPAFT-df=8		0.007	-1.4	84.8	6	7	237	0.001	-0.2	90.4	5	6	244	0.016	-3.2	90.0	3	8	248	-0.000	0.0	68.4	10	10	216
FPAFT-df=9		0.010	-2.0	78.4	5	8	226	0.002	-0.4	83.2	6	7	236	0.010	-2.0	88.0	4	9	242	0.003	-0.6	60.8	11	11	201

Table 3: Bias, percentage bias and coverage of estimates of $\log(-\log(S(t)))$ when $X=0$ and $\beta = .5$

Time	Model	Scenario 1				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4			
		Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.
1	Weibull	0.223	-9.7	18.4	250	-0.016	.	95.2	250	0.140	-13.4	34.8	250	-0.003	0.1	95.2	250
2	Weibull	-0.149	38.5	17.2	250	-0.131	-20.6	20.4	250	0.188	-36.5	2.8	250	-0.000	0.0	95.2	250
3	Weibull	-0.220	-37.5	2.0	250	-0.062	-7.1	75.2	250	0.108	-112.6	41.2	250	0.002	-0.2	95.2	250
4	Weibull	0.085	9.2	58.8	250	0.038	3.8	83.6	250	-0.017	-6.3	97.2	250	0.003	-0.5	95.2	250
5	Weibull	0.431	40.2	0.0	250	0.121	11.3	38.8	250	-0.102	-18.9	48.8	250	0.004	-1.1	95.2	250
1	Gamma	0.069	-3.0	87.6	250	-0.053	.	81.2	250	0.011	-1.1	91.6	238	-0.001	0.0	95.2	250
2	Gamma	-0.023	5.9	94.8	250	-0.143	-22.5	16.0	250	0.051	-9.9	78.8	238	-0.001	0.1	93.2	250
3	Gamma	-0.139	-23.7	16.4	250	-0.047	-5.4	82.0	250	0.020	-20.9	90.0	238	-0.002	0.2	92.4	250
4	Gamma	0.059	6.4	72.8	250	0.078	7.9	66.8	250	-0.024	-8.9	86.8	238	-0.000	0.0	94.0	250
5	Gamma	0.285	26.6	0.4	250	0.184	17.1	12.4	250	0.004	0.7	90.8	238	0.004	-1.1	95.6	250
1	GenF	0.013	-0.6	94.4	244	0.002	.	74.0	191	0.015	-1.4	29.2	85	-0.007	0.3	69.2	190
2	GenF	0.011	-2.8	94.8	247	-0.017	-2.7	74.4	193	0.050	-9.7	32.0	104	0.008	-0.5	70.8	196
3	GenF	-0.034	-5.8	86.4	247	-0.001	-0.1	74.0	193	0.035	-36.5	60.0	181	0.016	-1.6	70.8	199
4	GenF	0.029	3.1	86.8	247	0.030	3.0	68.4	193	0.037	13.7	65.2	226	0.024	-3.8	71.6	213
5	GenF	0.106	9.9	46.4	247	0.046	4.3	65.2	193	0.036	6.7	65.2	232	0.011	-3.0	72.8	216
1	FPAFT-df=2	-0.052	2.3	84.4	250	-0.057	.	76.4	250	0.065	-6.2	78.4	250	-0.325	14.1	14.8	250
2	FPAFT-df=2	-0.044	11.4	94.0	250	-0.124	-19.5	25.6	250	0.152	-29.5	18.8	250	-0.307	20.9	3.6	250
3	FPAFT-df=2	-0.190	-32.4	2.4	250	-0.021	-2.4	89.2	250	0.110	-114.7	40.0	250	-0.300	30.5	0.8	250
4	FPAFT-df=2	-0.025	-2.7	80.0	250	0.105	10.6	51.2	250	0.016	5.9	96.4	250	-0.296	46.3	0.0	250
5	FPAFT-df=2	0.190	17.7	17.2	250	0.209	19.4	4.8	250	-0.045	-8.3	88.4	250	-0.293	78.9	0.0	250
1	FPAFT-df=3	-0.179	7.8	59.2	250	-0.000	.	98.0	250	0.046	-4.4	88.4	250	-0.322	14.0	20.8	250
2	FPAFT-df=3	-0.058	15.0	78.0	250	-0.104	-16.3	39.6	250	0.076	-14.8	69.6	250	-0.306	20.8	4.4	250
3	FPAFT-df=3	-0.115	-19.6	27.6	250	-0.050	-5.7	79.6	250	0.082	-85.5	61.6	250	-0.301	30.6	5.6	250
4	FPAFT-df=3	-0.094	-10.2	44.8	250	0.035	3.5	85.2	250	0.051	18.9	78.4	250	-0.298	46.6	0.0	250
5	FPAFT-df=3	-0.045	-4.2	78.0	250	0.105	9.8	52.8	250	0.047	8.7	83.2	250	-0.294	79.2	0.0	250
1	FPAFT-df=4	-0.105	4.6	80.8	250	0.001	.	93.2	250	0.062	-5.9	75.2	250	-0.319	13.9	24.0	250
2	FPAFT-df=4	-0.106	27.4	59.2	250	-0.036	-5.7	90.4	250	0.075	-14.6	74.4	250	-0.308	20.9	6.4	250
3	FPAFT-df=4	-0.088	-15.0	49.2	250	-0.032	-3.7	87.2	250	0.073	-76.1	69.6	250	-0.302	30.7	6.0	250
4	FPAFT-df=4	-0.087	-9.4	50.8	250	-0.004	-0.4	91.2	250	0.051	18.9	78.8	250	-0.297	46.5	0.8	250
5	FPAFT-df=4	-0.079	-7.4	68.4	250	0.017	1.6	90.8	250	0.060	11.1	78.4	250	-0.294	79.2	0.0	250
1	FPAFT-df=5	-0.122	5.3	80.0	250	-0.011	.	93.2	250	0.062	-5.9	76.4	250	-0.318	13.8	24.4	250
2	FPAFT-df=5	-0.106	27.4	59.6	250	-0.025	-3.9	93.6	250	0.075	-14.6	72.8	250	-0.309	21.0	9.2	250
3	FPAFT-df=5	-0.082	-14.0	53.6	250	-0.025	-2.9	92.0	250	0.073	-76.1	75.2	250	-0.299	30.4	7.2	250
4	FPAFT-df=5	-0.080	-8.7	56.0	250	-0.007	-0.7	91.2	250	0.051	18.9	80.4	250	-0.298	46.6	1.6	250
5	FPAFT-df=5	-0.088	-8.2	65.2	250	0.005	0.5	92.0	250	0.058	10.7	79.6	250	-0.294	79.2	0.4	250
1	FPAFT-df=6	-0.118	5.1	81.2	250	-0.022	.	90.4	250	0.063	-6.0	76.8	250	-0.318	13.8	24.8	250
2	FPAFT-df=6	-0.099	25.6	63.6	250	-0.018	-2.8	94.4	250	0.072	-14.0	74.0	250	-0.308	20.9	8.4	250
3	FPAFT-df=6	-0.080	-13.6	55.2	250	-0.019	-2.2	92.8	250	0.076	-79.2	72.0	250	-0.299	30.4	9.2	250
4	FPAFT-df=6	-0.076	-8.3	57.2	250	-0.008	-0.8	92.8	250	0.052	19.3	80.0	250	-0.297	46.5	1.6	250
5	FPAFT-df=6	-0.090	-8.4	65.2	250	-0.004	-0.4	93.2	250	0.056	10.4	79.6	250	-0.294	79.2	0.0	250
1	FPAFT-df=7	-0.119	5.2	80.4	249	-0.023	.	90.4	250	0.062	-5.9	77.2	250	-0.318	13.8	24.4	250
2	FPAFT-df=7	-0.096	24.8	65.2	249	-0.015	-2.4	94.4	250	0.072	-14.0	74.4	250	-0.303	20.6	13.2	250
3	FPAFT-df=7	-0.081	-13.8	54.0	249	-0.014	-1.6	94.8	250	0.078	-81.3	69.6	250	-0.298	30.3	10.0	250
4	FPAFT-df=7	-0.071	-7.7	62.4	249	-0.007	-0.7	94.0	250	0.054	20.0	80.8	250	-0.295	46.2	3.2	250
5	FPAFT-df=7	-0.089	-8.3	64.0	249	-0.006	-0.6	93.2	250	0.056	10.4	81.2	250	-0.294	79.2	1.2	250
1	FPAFT-df=8	-0.117	5.1	80.8	249	-0.020	.	92.8	250	0.063	-6.0	77.2	250	-0.317	13.8	27.2	250
2	FPAFT-df=8	-0.097	25.0	66.4	249	-0.014	-2.2	94.0	250	0.073	-14.2	73.2	250	-0.306	20.8	10.0	250
3	FPAFT-df=8	-0.081	-13.8	54.8	249	-0.012	-1.4	94.0	250	0.078	-81.3	69.6	250	-0.298	30.3	10.4	250
4	FPAFT-df=8	-0.069	-7.5	63.2	249	-0.007	-0.7	93.6	250	0.056	20.8	78.4	250	-0.295	46.2	2.8	250
5	FPAFT-df=8	-0.089	-8.3	66.4	249	-0.009	-0.8	92.0	250	0.055	10.2	81.2	250	-0.294	79.2	0.8	250
1	FPAFT-df=9	-0.117	5.1	79.2	250	-0.019	.	90.4	250	0.063	-6.0	77.2	250	-0.315	13.7	28.0	250
2	FPAFT-df=9	-0.098	25.3	66.0	250	-0.015	-2.4	93.6	250	0.075	-14.6	73.2	250	-0.304	20.7	9.6	250
3	FPAFT-df=9	-0.083	-14.2	54.0	250	-0.010	-1.1	94.4	250	0.077	-80.3	70.8	250	-0.300	30.5	7.2	250
4	FPAFT-df=9	-0.068	-7.4	64.8	250	-0.007	-0.7	93.6	250	0.057	21.2	77.6	250	-0.297	46.5	1.6	250
5	FPAFT-df=9	-0.089	-8.3	64.8	250	-0.010	-0.9	92.4	250	0.055	10.2	81.6	250	-0.293	78.9	0.8	250

Table 4: Bias, percentage bias and coverage of estimates of $\log(-\log(S(t)))$ when $X=1$ and $\beta = .5$

Time	Model	Scenario 1				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4			
		Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.
1	Weibull	0.610	-16.9	0.0	250	0.132	-27.1	24.0	250	-0.050	3.6	88.8	250	-0.008	0.3	96.8	250
2	Weibull	0.306	-17.3	0.0	250	-0.026	-13.5	92.4	250	0.050	-5.5	87.2	250	-0.005	0.2	96.8	250
3	Weibull	0.082	-12.7	64.8	250	-0.091	-16.2	51.6	250	0.076	-12.7	74.8	250	-0.003	0.2	97.2	250
4	Weibull	-0.043	-36.1	88.4	250	-0.076	-9.9	68.8	250	0.050	-15.1	87.2	250	-0.002	0.2	97.2	250
5	Weibull	-0.032	-5.3	92.0	250	-0.022	-2.5	94.0	250	-0.011	13.3	96.0	250	-0.001	0.1	96.8	250
1	Gamma	-0.121	3.3	84.4	250	0.110	-22.5	37.2	250	-0.034	2.4	89.6	238	-0.007	0.2	96.8	250
2	Gamma	0.186	-10.5	31.2	250	-0.038	-19.8	88.0	250	0.013	-1.4	92.4	238	-0.002	0.1	97.2	250
3	Gamma	0.092	-14.2	61.2	250	-0.087	-15.4	55.2	250	0.035	-5.9	86.0	238	-0.002	0.1	96.4	250
4	Gamma	-0.036	-30.2	89.2	250	-0.053	-6.9	80.8	250	0.029	-8.8	89.6	238	-0.002	0.2	96.8	250
5	Gamma	-0.075	-12.4	67.6	250	0.018	2.1	94.0	250	0.001	-1.2	92.0	238	-0.001	0.1	97.2	250
1	GenF	0.056	-1.5	91.6	243	0.037	-7.6	67.2	183	-0.035	2.5	24.4	67	-0.036	1.2	70.8	187
2	GenF	-0.012	0.7	93.2	245	0.001	0.5	75.2	193	0.013	-1.4	30.0	89	-0.021	1.0	72.0	191
3	GenF	-0.005	0.8	92.8	247	-0.014	-2.5	72.4	193	0.038	-6.4	36.4	101	-0.013	0.8	72.0	194
4	GenF	0.009	7.6	96.8	247	-0.017	-2.2	70.0	193	0.033	-10.0	39.2	107	-0.006	0.5	72.8	195
5	GenF	-0.037	-6.1	85.2	247	-0.000	0.0	72.8	193	0.003	-3.6	64.8	176	0.001	-0.1	75.2	200
1	FPAFT-df=2	-0.431	11.9	43.6	250	0.093	-19.1	52.0	250	-0.099	7.1	68.0	250	-0.348	12.0	27.6	250
2	FPAFT-df=2	0.048	-2.7	80.0	250	-0.031	-16.1	90.0	250	0.003	-0.3	96.8	250	-0.326	15.7	16.0	250
3	FPAFT-df=2	0.018	-2.8	92.0	250	-0.067	-11.9	70.8	250	0.050	-8.4	88.0	250	-0.315	19.9	14.0	250
4	FPAFT-df=2	-0.109	-91.5	44.0	250	-0.027	-3.5	91.6	250	0.047	-14.2	88.4	250	-0.309	24.9	10.8	250
5	FPAFT-df=2	-0.168	-27.7	12.8	250	0.047	5.4	82.8	250	0.007	-8.4	98.0	250	-0.305	31.4	8.8	250
1	FPAFT-df=3	-0.191	5.3	84.0	250	0.050	-10.2	84.4	250	0.036	-2.6	94.4	250	-0.348	12.0	36.4	250
2	FPAFT-df=3	-0.230	13.0	25.6	250	-0.053	-27.6	79.6	250	0.031	-3.4	95.6	250	-0.325	15.7	20.4	250
3	FPAFT-df=3	-0.149	23.1	41.2	250	-0.113	-20.1	30.4	250	0.048	-8.0	87.2	250	-0.317	20.0	13.6	250
4	FPAFT-df=3	-0.100	-84.0	51.2	250	-0.105	-13.7	40.8	250	0.061	-18.5	80.0	250	-0.312	25.2	13.2	250
5	FPAFT-df=3	-0.149	-24.6	8.8	250	-0.059	-6.7	74.8	250	0.056	-67.5	83.2	250	-0.306	31.5	13.2	250
1	FPAFT-df=4	-0.135	3.7	88.8	250	-0.058	11.9	80.0	250	0.054	-3.9	87.2	250	-0.343	11.8	38.0	250
2	FPAFT-df=4	-0.145	8.2	62.8	250	-0.018	-9.4	89.6	250	0.064	-7.0	75.2	250	-0.321	15.5	18.8	250
3	FPAFT-df=4	-0.152	23.5	34.4	250	-0.045	-8.0	80.0	250	0.071	-11.9	69.2	250	-0.316	19.9	14.8	250
4	FPAFT-df=4	-0.093	-78.1	60.0	250	-0.055	-7.2	69.2	250	0.075	-22.7	71.6	250	-0.313	25.3	14.4	250
5	FPAFT-df=4	-0.108	-17.8	29.6	250	-0.042	-4.8	76.4	250	0.071	-85.6	79.6	250	-0.307	31.6	13.2	250
1	FPAFT-df=5	-0.140	3.9	90.0	250	-0.050	10.2	82.8	250	0.055	-4.0	86.0	250	-0.342	11.8	43.6	250
2	FPAFT-df=5	-0.141	8.0	64.0	250	-0.023	-12.0	88.4	250	0.059	-6.5	80.8	250	-0.322	15.5	22.8	250
3	FPAFT-df=5	-0.124	19.2	48.8	250	-0.033	-5.9	85.6	250	0.066	-11.1	71.6	250	-0.320	20.2	18.0	250
4	FPAFT-df=5	-0.102	-85.6	55.6	250	-0.043	-5.6	79.6	250	0.072	-21.8	72.0	250	-0.315	25.4	13.2	250
5	FPAFT-df=5	-0.096	-15.9	45.2	250	-0.034	-3.9	82.4	250	0.068	-81.9	80.8	250	-0.306	31.5	15.2	250
1	FPAFT-df=6	-0.131	3.6	90.4	250	-0.030	6.1	88.8	250	0.052	-3.7	87.2	250	-0.344	11.9	43.2	250
2	FPAFT-df=6	-0.133	7.5	70.4	250	-0.029	-15.1	86.4	250	0.060	-6.6	81.6	250	-0.328	15.8	22.8	250
3	FPAFT-df=6	-0.116	18.0	58.8	250	-0.025	-4.4	86.8	250	0.063	-10.6	79.2	250	-0.324	20.5	17.6	250
4	FPAFT-df=6	-0.105	-88.2	54.8	250	-0.031	-4.1	85.2	250	0.070	-21.2	73.6	250	-0.316	25.5	12.8	250
5	FPAFT-df=6	-0.091	-15.0	48.8	250	-0.025	-2.8	86.4	250	0.068	-81.9	78.4	250	-0.311	32.0	14.0	250
1	FPAFT-df=7	-0.130	3.6	89.6	249	-0.027	5.5	88.0	250	0.052	-3.7	87.6	250	-0.344	11.9	43.6	250
2	FPAFT-df=7	-0.126	7.1	69.2	249	-0.031	-16.1	86.4	250	0.060	-6.6	80.8	250	-0.332	16.0	24.8	250
3	FPAFT-df=7	-0.113	17.5	58.8	249	-0.020	-3.6	87.2	250	0.065	-10.9	73.6	250	-0.324	20.5	18.4	250
4	FPAFT-df=7	-0.103	-86.5	51.2	249	-0.023	-3.0	86.4	250	0.070	-21.2	73.6	250	-0.317	25.6	16.0	250
5	FPAFT-df=7	-0.087	-14.4	50.8	249	-0.018	-2.1	86.4	250	0.070	-84.3	76.8	250	-0.312	32.1	16.8	250
1	FPAFT-df=8	-0.132	3.6	89.6	249	-0.028	5.7	86.0	250	0.052	-3.7	87.6	250	-0.340	11.7	44.4	250
2	FPAFT-df=8	-0.124	7.0	72.4	249	-0.031	-16.1	81.6	250	0.059	-6.5	80.4	250	-0.325	15.7	29.6	250
3	FPAFT-df=8	-0.112	17.3	63.2	249	-0.021	-3.7	84.0	250	0.065	-10.9	74.0	250	-0.322	20.3	17.6	250
4	FPAFT-df=8	-0.102	-85.6	53.2	249	-0.021	-2.7	84.4	250	0.068	-20.6	74.0	250	-0.313	25.3	16.0	250
5	FPAFT-df=8	-0.088	-14.5	51.2	249	-0.016	-1.8	85.6	250	0.070	-84.3	74.8	250	-0.308	31.7	18.8	250
1	FPAFT-df=9	-0.133	3.7	92.0	250	-0.025	5.1	84.0	250	0.051	-3.7	86.4	250	-0.342	11.8	46.0	250
2	FPAFT-df=9	-0.121	6.8	72.8	250	-0.028	-14.6	81.2	250	0.059	-6.5	80.4	250	-0.328	15.8	26.8	250
3	FPAFT-df=9	-0.111	17.2	59.6	250	-0.020	-3.6	82.8	250	0.065	-10.9	74.8	250	-0.322	20.3	16.8	250
4	FPAFT-df=9	-0.100	-84.0	53.2	250	-0.018	-2.4	85.6	250	0.067	-20.3	71.2	250	-0.315	25.4	14.8	250
5	FPAFT-df=9	-0.088	-14.5	51.6	250	-0.013	-1.5	86.8	250	0.069	-83.1	73.2	250	-0.310	31.9	13.2	250

Table 5: Bias, percentage bias and coverage of estimates of $\log(-\log(S(t)))$ when $X=0$ and $\beta = -.5$

Time	Model	Scenario 1				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4			
		Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.
1	Weibull	0.590	-25.6	0.0	250	-0.003	.	96.0	250	0.096	-9.2	60.8	250	0.000	0.0	96.4	250
2	Weibull	-0.014	3.6	94.4	250	-0.139	-21.8	15.2	250	0.170	-33.0	9.6	250	0.002	-0.1	97.2	250
3	Weibull	-0.221	-37.7	0.4	250	-0.083	-9.5	55.6	250	0.105	-109.5	41.6	250	0.003	-0.3	95.2	250
4	Weibull	-0.011	-1.2	89.6	250	0.009	0.9	93.6	250	-0.008	-3.0	97.6	250	0.003	-0.5	96.0	250
5	Weibull	0.259	24.1	0.4	250	0.085	7.9	61.2	250	-0.085	-15.7	59.2	250	0.004	-1.1	94.8	250
1	Gamma	0.192	-8.3	46.4	250	-0.010	.	95.2	250	0.067	-6.4	72.8	250	-0.002	0.1	95.6	250
2	Gamma	0.034	-8.8	92.0	250	-0.140	-22.0	14.8	250	0.121	-23.5	26.0	250	0.003	-0.2	97.2	250
3	Gamma	-0.166	-28.3	4.0	250	-0.078	-8.9	62.0	250	0.079	-82.4	60.8	250	0.003	-0.3	95.6	250
4	Gamma	-0.036	-3.9	86.0	250	0.019	1.9	91.6	250	0.002	0.7	97.2	250	0.003	-0.5	96.0	250
5	Gamma	0.135	12.6	19.6	250	0.101	9.4	54.0	250	-0.031	-5.7	92.0	250	0.003	-0.8	94.8	250
1	GenF	0.013	-0.6	94.8	244	0.004	.	70.8	183	-0.007	0.7	18.0	45	-0.013	0.6	86.0	233
2	GenF	0.011	-2.8	94.0	248	-0.023	-3.6	69.6	185	0.047	-9.1	30.0	87	-0.011	0.7	86.8	234
3	GenF	-0.049	-8.4	79.6	248	-0.010	-1.1	71.2	185	0.025	-26.1	38.4	98	-0.006	0.6	85.2	234
4	GenF	0.001	0.1	93.2	248	0.019	1.9	66.8	185	-0.004	-1.5	42.4	109	-0.001	0.2	85.2	234
5	GenF	0.071	6.6	60.8	248	0.034	3.2	65.6	185	-0.017	-3.1	41.6	109	0.000	0.0	84.8	238
1	FPAFT-df=2	0.111	-4.8	72.4	250	-0.033	.	88.8	250	0.012	-1.1	94.4	250	0.309	-13.4	3.2	250
2	FPAFT-df=2	0.146	-37.7	21.2	250	-0.144	-22.6	14.0	250	0.103	-20.0	45.6	250	0.305	-20.7	0.4	250
3	FPAFT-df=2	-0.079	-13.5	53.2	250	-0.067	-7.7	69.6	250	0.071	-74.0	68.0	250	0.301	-30.6	0.4	250
4	FPAFT-df=2	-0.018	-2.0	94.4	250	0.039	3.9	85.6	250	-0.013	-4.8	95.6	250	0.298	-46.6	0.0	250
5	FPAFT-df=2	0.084	7.8	57.2	250	0.128	11.9	36.8	250	-0.063	-11.7	76.4	250	0.295	-79.5	0.0	250
1	FPAFT-df=3	0.076	-3.3	88.8	250	0.057	.	79.2	250	0.040	-3.8	89.2	250	0.309	-13.4	5.2	250
2	FPAFT-df=3	0.101	-26.1	49.6	250	-0.078	-12.3	61.2	250	0.059	-11.5	78.4	250	0.307	-20.9	0.4	250
3	FPAFT-df=3	0.004	0.7	91.6	250	-0.061	-7.0	73.2	250	0.018	-18.8	93.6	250	0.302	-30.7	0.4	250
4	FPAFT-df=3	0.039	4.2	84.8	250	-0.009	-0.9	93.2	250	-0.045	-16.7	82.8	250	0.298	-46.6	0.0	250
5	FPAFT-df=3	0.076	7.1	57.6	250	0.032	3.0	87.6	250	-0.065	-12.0	74.8	250	0.294	-79.2	0.0	250
1	FPAFT-df=4	0.081	-3.5	84.4	249	0.038	.	81.6	250	-0.021	2.0	93.6	250	0.310	-13.5	5.6	250
2	FPAFT-df=4	0.095	-24.5	60.8	249	0.001	0.2	94.8	250	0.026	-5.1	89.6	250	0.304	-20.7	0.8	250
3	FPAFT-df=4	0.005	0.9	90.4	249	0.000	0.0	95.6	250	0.044	-45.9	82.4	250	0.304	-30.9	0.4	250
4	FPAFT-df=4	0.045	4.9	81.2	249	0.016	1.6	93.6	250	-0.008	-3.0	96.0	250	0.300	-46.9	0.4	250
5	FPAFT-df=4	0.081	7.6	55.2	249	0.020	1.9	93.6	250	-0.045	-8.3	87.2	250	0.294	-79.2	0.0	250
1	FPAFT-df=5	0.083	-3.6	85.6	250	0.031	.	88.0	250	0.007	-0.7	95.6	250	0.310	-13.5	5.2	250
2	FPAFT-df=5	0.098	-25.3	59.2	250	0.006	0.9	92.0	250	-0.003	0.6	95.6	250	0.304	-20.7	0.8	250
3	FPAFT-df=5	0.004	0.7	89.2	250	0.007	0.8	95.2	250	0.028	-29.2	85.2	250	0.304	-30.9	0.4	250
4	FPAFT-df=5	0.042	4.6	82.0	250	0.021	2.1	92.0	250	0.015	5.6	91.2	250	0.300	-46.9	0.0	250
5	FPAFT-df=5	0.078	7.3	57.6	250	0.022	2.0	93.2	250	-0.023	-4.3	91.6	250	0.294	-79.2	0.0	250
1	FPAFT-df=6	0.076	-3.3	86.8	250	0.025	.	90.8	250	0.004	-0.4	96.4	250	0.311	-13.5	6.0	250
2	FPAFT-df=6	0.089	-23.0	64.8	250	0.008	1.3	90.8	250	0.005	-1.0	96.4	250	0.305	-20.7	0.4	250
3	FPAFT-df=6	0.005	0.9	90.8	250	0.013	1.5	93.6	250	0.010	-10.4	88.0	250	0.304	-30.9	0.4	250
4	FPAFT-df=6	0.036	3.9	85.2	250	0.025	2.5	90.4	250	0.020	7.4	89.2	250	0.301	-47.1	0.0	250
5	FPAFT-df=6	0.073	6.8	61.6	250	0.024	2.2	93.2	250	-0.010	-1.8	93.6	250	0.294	-79.2	0.0	250
1	FPAFT-df=7	0.076	-3.3	86.0	248	0.027	.	91.6	250	0.002	-0.2	96.4	249	0.310	-13.5	6.4	250
2	FPAFT-df=7	0.084	-21.7	67.2	248	0.007	1.1	90.4	250	0.010	-1.9	94.8	249	0.307	-20.9	1.6	250
3	FPAFT-df=7	0.009	1.5	90.4	248	0.015	1.7	93.6	250	0.005	-5.2	92.0	249	0.305	-31.0	0.8	250
4	FPAFT-df=7	0.031	3.4	88.0	248	0.028	2.8	91.2	250	0.018	6.7	87.2	249	0.301	-47.1	0.8	250
5	FPAFT-df=7	0.068	6.3	66.4	248	0.026	2.4	92.0	250	-0.003	-0.6	93.6	249	0.295	-79.5	0.8	250
1	FPAFT-df=8	0.075	-3.3	85.6	249	0.026	.	89.6	250	0.004	-0.4	95.6	250	0.307	-13.3	8.8	249
2	FPAFT-df=8	0.085	-21.9	65.6	249	0.007	1.1	90.8	250	0.008	-1.6	95.6	250	0.306	-20.8	1.2	249
3	FPAFT-df=8	0.015	2.6	89.6	249	0.014	1.6	92.4	250	0.006	-6.3	91.6	250	0.304	-30.9	1.2	249
4	FPAFT-df=8	0.026	2.8	89.2	249	0.027	2.7	90.4	250	0.014	5.2	84.8	250	0.299	-46.8	0.4	249
5	FPAFT-df=8	0.064	6.0	68.8	249	0.025	2.3	91.2	250	0.000	0.0	92.0	250	0.292	-78.7	1.2	249
1	FPAFT-df=9	0.075	-3.3	85.2	249	0.024	.	91.2	250	0.004	-0.4	95.2	249	0.305	-13.2	12.8	249
2	FPAFT-df=9	0.085	-21.9	64.4	249	0.007	1.1	90.8	250	0.007	-1.4	95.6	249	0.304	-20.7	2.4	249
3	FPAFT-df=9	0.023	3.9	89.2	249	0.013	1.5	92.4	250	0.008	-8.3	93.2	249	0.302	-30.7	0.8	249
4	FPAFT-df=9	0.022	2.4	90.0	249	0.026	2.6	90.8	250	0.010	3.7	85.2	249	0.299	-46.8	2.4	249
5	FPAFT-df=9	0.059	5.5	74.0	249	0.025	2.3	91.6	250	0.002	0.4	92.0	249	0.293	-78.9	1.6	249

Table 6: Bias, percentage bias and coverage of estimates of $\log(-\log(S(t)))$ when $X=1$ and $\beta = -.5$

Time	Model	Scenario 1				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4			
		Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.	Bias	% Bias	Cov.	# Conv.
1	Weibull	0.046	-5.0	87.2	250	-0.152	-31.7	10.4	250	0.157	-23.2	15.6	250	-0.003	0.2	96.0	250
2	Weibull	-0.298	-40.5	0.0	250	-0.085	-9.3	57.2	250	0.066	334.4	73.6	250	-0.001	0.1	96.0	250
3	Weibull	0.140	13.1	28.8	250	0.051	4.8	78.8	250	-0.089	-16.8	52.0	250	-0.000	0.0	96.4	250
4	Weibull	0.453	35.0	0.0	250	0.148	12.5	24.8	250	-0.082	-10.6	61.6	250	0.000	0.0	96.8	250
5	Weibull	0.660	43.7	0.0	250	0.220	17.3	2.8	250	-0.027	-3.0	90.4	250	0.001	0.4	95.2	250
1	Gamma	0.115	-12.5	54.0	250	-0.160	-33.3	6.4	250	0.049	-7.2	86.4	250	0.000	0.0	95.2	250
2	Gamma	-0.173	-23.5	2.8	250	-0.083	-9.1	59.2	250	-0.020	-101.3	92.8	250	0.001	-0.1	96.8	250
3	Gamma	0.113	10.6	35.6	250	0.062	5.8	74.4	250	-0.115	-21.7	33.2	250	0.001	-0.3	96.0	250
4	Gamma	0.260	20.1	0.0	250	0.166	14.0	21.2	250	-0.037	-4.8	86.4	250	0.000	0.0	96.4	250
5	Gamma	0.312	20.6	0.0	250	0.245	19.3	2.0	250	0.093	10.2	63.6	250	0.000	0.0	96.0	250
1	GenF	-0.019	2.1	94.4	248	-0.010	-2.1	70.8	185	0.046	-6.8	26.8	74	-0.008	0.5	85.6	232
2	GenF	-0.057	-7.7	69.6	248	-0.000	0.0	71.6	185	0.019	96.3	38.4	98	0.000	0.0	84.4	232
3	GenF	0.068	6.4	64.0	248	0.033	3.1	63.2	185	-0.012	-2.3	42.4	108	0.005	-1.3	86.0	234
4	GenF	0.068	5.2	67.6	248	0.038	3.2	63.2	185	0.009	1.2	41.2	108	0.001	-2.6	87.6	237
5	GenF	0.001	0.1	94.8	248	0.030	2.4	64.8	185	0.036	3.9	40.0	108	-0.012	-5.2	85.6	237
1	FPAFT-df=2	0.154	-16.8	35.6	250	-0.166	-34.6	6.8	250	0.053	-7.8	84.0	250	0.305	-17.9	7.2	250
2	FPAFT-df=2	-0.125	-17.0	16.0	250	-0.066	-7.2	67.6	250	0.010	50.7	96.8	250	0.298	-34.2	2.4	250
3	FPAFT-df=2	0.053	5.0	74.4	250	0.093	8.7	56.8	250	-0.100	-18.9	44.0	250	0.292	-76.0	1.2	250
4	FPAFT-df=2	0.113	8.7	54.0	250	0.206	17.4	6.4	250	-0.057	-7.4	76.0	250	0.289	-740.4	1.6	250
5	FPAFT-df=2	0.109	7.2	67.2	250	0.292	23.0	0.0	250	0.027	3.0	92.0	250	0.286	125.0	2.4	250
1	FPAFT-df=3	0.090	-9.8	66.8	250	-0.126	-26.2	20.4	250	0.026	-3.8	94.8	250	0.308	-18.1	7.6	250
2	FPAFT-df=3	-0.004	-0.5	92.8	250	-0.108	-11.8	28.0	250	-0.045	-228.0	87.6	250	0.299	-34.3	5.6	250
3	FPAFT-df=3	0.077	7.2	57.2	250	-0.029	-2.7	84.0	250	-0.113	-21.4	32.0	250	0.291	-75.7	1.6	250
4	FPAFT-df=3	0.015	1.2	96.0	250	0.020	1.7	90.4	250	-0.023	-3.0	91.2	250	0.287	-735.3	2.0	250
5	FPAFT-df=3	-0.092	-6.1	72.8	250	0.054	4.2	83.6	250	0.103	11.3	54.8	250	0.283	123.7	4.8	250
1	FPAFT-df=4	0.107	-11.6	59.6	249	0.010	2.1	88.4	250	-0.050	7.4	83.6	250	0.306	-18.0	7.6	250
2	FPAFT-df=4	0.005	0.7	91.6	249	0.001	0.1	90.4	250	-0.036	-182.4	89.6	250	0.303	-34.8	5.2	250
3	FPAFT-df=4	0.084	7.9	52.0	249	0.017	1.6	93.6	250	-0.108	-20.4	36.0	250	0.289	-75.2	2.4	250
4	FPAFT-df=4	0.017	1.3	96.8	249	0.010	0.8	94.8	250	-0.055	-7.1	78.0	250	0.281	-719.9	3.6	250
5	FPAFT-df=4	-0.095	-6.3	72.0	249	-0.001	-0.1	95.6	250	0.033	3.6	91.6	250	0.274	119.8	19.6	250
1	FPAFT-df=5	0.094	-10.2	66.4	250	0.016	3.3	89.6	250	-0.036	5.3	87.6	250	0.306	-18.0	8.8	250
2	FPAFT-df=5	0.000	0.0	89.2	250	0.011	1.2	92.4	250	-0.025	-126.7	84.8	250	0.302	-34.7	6.8	250
3	FPAFT-df=5	0.080	7.5	57.2	250	0.021	2.0	92.4	250	-0.066	-12.5	65.2	250	0.289	-75.2	3.6	250
4	FPAFT-df=5	0.015	1.2	96.0	250	0.009	0.8	94.8	250	-0.040	-5.2	80.0	250	0.279	-714.8	5.2	250
5	FPAFT-df=5	-0.094	-6.2	72.4	250	-0.006	-0.5	96.8	250	0.013	1.4	94.4	250	0.272	118.9	35.6	250
1	FPAFT-df=6	0.088	-9.6	68.8	250	0.019	4.0	86.0	250	-0.016	2.4	93.6	250	0.306	-18.0	9.2	250
2	FPAFT-df=6	-0.006	-0.8	86.8	250	0.019	2.1	92.0	250	-0.023	-116.5	80.8	250	0.302	-34.7	8.8	250
3	FPAFT-df=6	0.073	6.9	60.4	250	0.025	2.3	92.4	250	-0.040	-7.6	80.8	250	0.289	-75.2	5.6	250
4	FPAFT-df=6	0.015	1.2	96.8	250	0.008	0.7	95.6	250	-0.027	-3.5	87.6	250	0.279	-714.8	7.6	250
5	FPAFT-df=6	-0.088	-5.8	76.4	250	-0.011	-0.9	96.4	250	0.006	0.7	95.2	250	0.271	118.5	38.0	250
1	FPAFT-df=7	0.076	-8.3	68.4	248	0.017	3.5	86.4	250	-0.011	1.6	92.0	249	0.300	-17.6	12.4	250
2	FPAFT-df=7	-0.012	-1.6	87.6	248	0.021	2.3	89.2	250	-0.019	-96.3	83.2	249	0.296	-34.0	11.2	250
3	FPAFT-df=7	0.065	6.1	68.4	248	0.027	2.5	90.0	250	-0.024	-4.5	84.8	249	0.284	-73.9	8.4	250
4	FPAFT-df=7	0.013	1.0	95.2	248	0.010	0.8	96.0	250	-0.018	-2.3	90.8	249	0.277	-709.7	11.2	250
5	FPAFT-df=7	-0.084	-5.6	79.2	248	-0.010	-0.8	96.0	250	0.002	0.2	93.6	249	0.271	118.5	46.0	250
1	FPAFT-df=8	0.063	-6.9	72.0	249	0.014	2.9	82.8	250	-0.007	1.0	93.2	250	0.308	-18.1	15.6	249
2	FPAFT-df=8	-0.015	-2.0	86.4	249	0.018	2.0	88.4	250	-0.013	-65.9	84.8	250	0.300	-34.5	12.8	249
3	FPAFT-df=8	0.057	5.4	72.8	249	0.024	2.2	91.2	250	-0.015	-2.8	89.2	250	0.288	-75.0	8.8	249
4	FPAFT-df=8	0.012	0.9	94.8	249	0.008	0.7	94.0	250	-0.012	-1.6	92.8	250	0.282	-722.5	15.6	249
5	FPAFT-df=8	-0.078	-5.2	80.8	249	-0.012	-0.9	94.8	250	0.001	0.1	94.8	250	0.278	121.5	50.4	249
1	FPAFT-df=9	0.057	-6.2	73.6	249	0.014	2.9	83.6	250	-0.002	0.3	91.2	249	0.299	-17.6	17.2	249
2	FPAFT-df=9	-0.014	-1.9	86.4	249	0.016	1.8	88.8	250	-0.006	-30.4	84.4	249	0.293	-33.6	10.4	249
3	FPAFT-df=9	0.051	4.8	77.2	249	0.024	2.2	90.0	250	-0.008	-1.5	88.0	249	0.283	-73.6	8.4	249
4	FPAFT-df=9	0.012	0.9	95.6	249	0.008	0.7	94.4	250	-0.007	-0.9	92.4	249	0.281	-719.9	18.4	249
5	FPAFT-df=9	-0.072	-4.8	85.2	249	-0.010	-0.8	95.6	250	0.002	0.2	94.0	249	0.281	122.8	54.8	249

Table 7: Comparison of parametric AFT models applied to the England and Wales breast cancer dataset.

Model	Estimate	Std. Err.	95% CI		AIC	BIC
Weibull	-0.258	0.038	-0.331	-0.184	17622.17	17640.03
Gen. Gamma	-0.287	0.041	-0.367	-0.207	17606.17	17629.99
Gen. F	-0.348	0.041	-0.375	-0.199	17544.37	17574.14
FPAFT df=2	-0.263	0.039	-0.339	-0.188	17619.39	17643.21
FPAFT df=3	-0.296	0.039	-0.372	-0.220	17524.85	17554.62
FPAFT df=4	-0.304	0.041	-0.385	-0.223	17526.47	17562.20
FPAFT df=5	-0.307	0.042	-0.390	-0.224	17527.91	17569.58
FPAFT df=6	-0.308	0.043	-0.391	-0.224	17529.84	17577.47
FPAFT df=7	-0.309	0.043	-0.394	-0.224	17531.44	17585.03
FPAFT df=8	-0.323	0.042	-0.405	-0.242	17529.52	17589.06
FPAFT df=9	-0.345	0.047	-0.438	-0.252	17529.18	17594.67